



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/849,990	05/21/2004	Ian M. Penn	213202.00506	8691
7590	06/16/2005		EXAMINER	
Patent Administrator KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN Suite 1600 525 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60661-3693			MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	
DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/849,990	PENN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	William H. Matthews (Howie)	3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 55-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 69-72 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,55-64,67 and 68 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 65 and 66 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-3-04.
  - 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
  - 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 49 of U.S. Patent No. 6,183,506.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 49 of the patent "anticipates" application claim 1.

Accordingly, application claim 1 is not patentably distinct from patented claim 49.

Patented claim 49 requires the same stent components as application claim 1, and recites both side walls (which are substantially parallel to longitudinal axis) as having a curvature. Pending claim 1 recites a single side wall with the curvature termed a flex

member which does not add patentably distinct structural differences. Thus it is apparent that the more specific patented claim 49 encompasses application claim 1. Following the rationale in *In re Goodman* cited in the preceding paragraph, where applicant has once been granted a patent containing a claim for the specific or narrower invention, applicant may not then obtain a second patent with a claim for the generic or broader invention without first submitting an appropriate terminal disclaimer.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1,55-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 1 recites at line 12 "the side wall" which lacks proper antecedence because a pair of side walls have been defined.

6. Claim 60 refers to claim 7 which has been previously cancelled.

7. Claim 61 recites "a plurality of longitudinal portions" (line 4), "a longitudinal portion" (line 6), and said plurality of longitudinal portions (line 9). Therefore it is unclear if line 6 recites a structural element different from line 4 and whether or not line 9 refers to both lines 4 and 6.

8. Claims 55-59,62-68 are rejected for depending from the claims above.

***Specification***

9. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the limitations "peaks" and "valleys" in newly added claims 61-72 lack proper description in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1,55-57,60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Orth et al. US PN 5,591,197.

Orth et al. discloses in figure 4-4A a stent comprising a stent wall formed of intersecting members forming a repeating polygonal pattern including sidewalls 16 or 22 substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis, a concave shaped wall having an apex, a convex shaped wall having an apex, at least one of the first and second apex being flat, and wherein the stent is expandable. Regarding claims 1 and 55-57 the sidewall comprises straight portion 16 and the adjacent curved portion. Regarding claims 61-63 the longitudinal portion having a U-shaped portion in two dimensions is strut 22.

12. Claims 1,55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wijay US PN 6,053,940.

Wijay discloses in figure 2A a stent comprising a stent wall formed of intersecting members forming a repeating polygonal pattern including sidewalls 3 substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis, a concave shaped wall having an apex, a convex shaped wall having an apex, at least one of the first and second apex being flat, and wherein the stent is expandable.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 59,67,68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orth et al. USPN 5,591,197 as applied to claims 1 and 61 above, and further in view of Anderson et al. US PN .

15. Orth et al. meets the structural limitations of claims 59,67,68 as described above but lacks the express written disclosure of including a medicinal coating. Anderson teaches in line 40 of col. 6 through line 8 of col. 7 a stent having a medicinal coating in order to improve the effectiveness of the stent.

16. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the stent disclosed by Orth et al. to include the medicinal coating taught by Anderson et al. in order to improve the effectiveness of the stent.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

17. Claims 69-72 are allowed.

18. Claims 65-66 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number is 703-305-0316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
WHM  
June 12, 2005

  
CORRINE McDERMOTT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700